



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,515	01/23/2006	Stephen Augustyn	PB60373USW	2676
23347	7590	07/08/2011		
GLAXOSMITHKLINE				
GLOBAL PATENTS				
FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398				
MAIL STOP: C.2111F				
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398				
EXAMINER				
OSTRUP, CLINTON T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3771				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/08/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USCIPRTP@GSK.COM

ELAINE.X.MARTENS@GSK.COM

PATRICIA.T.WILSON@GSK.COM

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>		Application No. 10/565,515 Examiner CLINTON T. OSTRUP	Applicant(s) AUGUSTYN ET AL. Art Unit 3771
--	--	--	---

All Participants:

(1) CLINTON T. OSTRUP.

(2) ROBERT J. SMITH.

Date of Interview: 22 June 2011

Status of Application: Amended

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 10:45 AM+/-

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
None

Claims discussed:
None

Prior art documents discussed:
None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/CLINTON T. OSTRUP/
Examiner, Art Unit 3771

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed Mr. Smith that the correction of inventorship submitted 6/21/2011 was not in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) because it lacked a fee as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i). Moreover, the examiner asked for clarification of the correction of inventorship which lists Paul Rand, Michael Davies, Stephen Augustyn, and Stephen Harvey as inventors, and deletes Mark Palmer and Alan Wilson as inventors, because the inventorship and declaration filed 1/23/2006 lists seven people as inventors, one of which is not listed in the correction of inventorship submitted 6/21/2011, namely Gary Crosby. It was agreed that an Ex Parte Quayle Action would be mailed in order to allow time to determine the inventorship status of Gary Crosby. .